The Sovereign Brand: Extrapolating Trumpism into a Postmodern Fascist Ideology

Douglas C. Youvan

doug@youvan.com

May 24, 2025

This paper offers a conceptual extrapolation of Donald Trump's political style into a fully developed system of governance. While Trump himself never articulated a formal ideology, his persistent behaviors—emphasizing personal loyalty, media spectacle, antagonism toward institutions, and emotive nationalism—point toward a distinctive political form. We argue that Trumpism, when projected beyond constitutional limits and democratic resistance, becomes a model of postmodern fascism: a system defined not by policy coherence or traditional doctrine, but by emotional performance, narrative dominance, and the collapse of truth into brand loyalty. Unlike classical fascist movements rooted in militarism and rigid ideology, this emergent form thrives on fragmented media ecosystems, identity signaling, and the erosion of institutional legitimacy. Trump is not the final form of this system, but its prototype—an early-stage mutation of democratic authoritarianism fit for the 21st century. The real danger lies not in the man himself, but in the cultural and political template he leaves behind for future, more disciplined iterations.

Keywords: Trumpism, authoritarianism, postmodern fascism, political branding, narrative control, loyalty politics, media spectacle, epistemology, populism, democratic erosion, affective governance, truth manipulation, identity politics, culture war, soft totalitarianism. A collaboration with GPT-4o. CC4.0.

Abstract

This paper argues that the political behavior, rhetorical style, and cultural instincts of Donald J. Trump—while lacking a formalized doctrine—nonetheless constitute an emergent and coherent philosophical posture when extrapolated to its logical extremes. Far from being ideologically incoherent or purely opportunistic, Trump's patterns of action and discourse reveal the contours of a postmodern political framework centered on personal dominance, control over perception, and cultural conquest through narrative and branding.

Unlike classical fascism, which relied on militarization, state violence, and rigid ideological programs, the extrapolated Trumpist model operates through symbolic manipulation, loyalty rituals, and control of the informational environment. In this system, truth is subordinate to narrative repetition, institutions are valuable only to the extent that they affirm the leader, and culture is not pluralistic but reverential—organized around a mythic self-image of the sovereign figure. This form of rule does not emerge through coup or revolution but through the corrosion of democratic norms, the spectacle of populist performance, and the systematic replacement of shared civic truths with affective allegiance.

The extrapolated ideology is thus a postmodern fascism: not grounded in a single race or class doctrine, but in the elevation of the leader as the sole reference point of legitimacy, truth, and national identity. It thrives in a fragmented information age where belief outpaces verification, where institutions lose coherence, and where emotional loyalty outweighs constitutional structure. This paper explores the potential shape, mechanisms, and dangers of such a system—one that may already exist in blueprint form and awaits only the next iteration to achieve permanence.

1. Introduction

Donald J. Trump, unlike many influential political figures, has never authored a treatise or manifesto outlining his worldview. He does not articulate his principles through traditional ideological language, nor does he appeal to foundational

political texts or philosophical traditions. Instead, his public identity is constructed through instinct, assertion, repetition, and performance. The absence of a formal Trumpist philosophy has led many to dismiss his politics as incoherent, purely reactionary, or devoid of intellectual content.

This paper challenges that assumption. While Trump may not engage in traditional philosophy, his behavior over time displays consistent patterns of thought and governance that point toward an implicit worldview. These patterns are observable in his approach to power, truth, loyalty, opposition, and culture. When these behavioral regularities are extrapolated beyond the institutional limits imposed by American democracy—such as legal checks, a free press, or electoral accountability—they begin to outline a cohesive, though implicit, ideology. It is not abstract or internally consistent in the way liberalism or Marxism might be, but it is functionally coherent: it provides a logic for action, a hierarchy of values, and a vision of society organized around personal domination, affective loyalty, and symbolic control.

The justification for such an extrapolation lies in the consistency of Trump's instincts across contexts: his reaction to criticism is invariably to delegitimize the critic; his concept of loyalty is absolute and personal; his relationship with truth is contingent on usefulness; his understanding of culture is vertical, not pluralistic. These recurring responses are not random; they reveal a political style and structure of belief that, taken to its extreme, point to a governing philosophy.

To understand this extrapolated model, the paper draws on three primary analytic frameworks:

1. Political theory, particularly the work on authoritarianism, fascism, and legitimacy.
2. Leadership psychology, especially literature on narcissistic, transactional, and charismatic leadership models.
3. Historical analogy, comparing the extrapolated Trumpist model to past and present leaders who substituted personal loyalty and symbolic control for institutional norms and democratic constraints.

This approach allows us to take Trump seriously not as a statesman or policy-maker in the conventional sense, but as a cultural and political phenomenon—one that reflects deeper trends in postmodern politics, and one that may serve as a prototype for a future political form: an aestheticized, media-driven, post-ideological version of fascism.

2. Axioms of the Extrapolated Trumpist System

While Donald Trump does not explicitly articulate a political ideology, his persistent behaviors, rhetoric, and decision-making reflect an underlying set of principles—axioms—that govern his understanding of power, society, and human relations. These axioms, when abstracted from their context and projected into a system, form the foundation of an extrapolated Trumpist political philosophy. They are not theoretical in origin, but rather arise from practice; they are not codified in law, but in performance. This section outlines five core axioms at the heart of this system.

2.1 Control is Superior to Truth

In the extrapolated Trumpist worldview, truth is not a universal or discoverable entity—it is a tool of utility. Assertions are not evaluated by their correspondence to fact, but by their effectiveness in establishing dominance, shaping public perception, or silencing opposition. The question “Is it true?” is replaced by “Does it serve me?”

This instrumentalization of truth can be seen in Trump's consistent use of misinformation, exaggerated claims, and strategic falsehoods. From inauguration crowd sizes to election outcomes, his pattern is clear: truth is flexible, malleable, and subordinate to narrative control. In the extrapolated system, truth becomes a function of repetition, volume, and loyalty—not evidence or logic. Independent sources of truth (press, academia, scientific institutions) are therefore enemies of the regime, unless they can be co-opted into the narrative.

2.2 Loyalty is Superior to Merit

The elevation of loyalty above competence is perhaps the most visible and consequential axiom in Trump's leadership style. Decisions about hiring, appointments, endorsements, and even foreign policy are filtered through a loyalty test. Those who affirm the leader are elevated, regardless of expertise; those who question or defy him, no matter their qualifications, are discarded or publicly denounced.

In the extrapolated regime, this principle becomes systemic. Meritocratic institutions—such as civil service, the judiciary, academia, and science—are hollowed out and replaced by networks of personal allegiance. Government functions not as an instrument of law or policy, but as a means of reinforcing the leader's will. Success in this system is not earned; it is granted through proximity to power.

2.3 Identity is Defined by Allegiance

Trump's political rhetoric consistently divides the world into two camps: those who are loyal and those who are enemies. There is little space for neutral citizenship or good-faith disagreement. One is either "with us or against us," "patriotic" or "un-American." Allegiance, not values or principles, defines belonging.

This logic redefines identity as relational rather than intrinsic. Citizenship becomes conditional, determined by loyalty to the leader and participation in the leader's narrative. Dissenters—whether journalists, judges, or protesters—are not viewed as fellow citizens exercising rights, but as outsiders undermining the unity of the state. Allegiance becomes the measure of legitimacy, and ideological purity is replaced by personal fidelity.

2.4 Power is Its Own Justification

Traditional political systems often justify power by appealing to higher ends: justice, the common good, religious authority, or constitutional principles. In the Trumpist system, power justifies itself. The success of the leader—measured in popularity, wealth, or domination of adversaries—is the primary moral criterion.

This Machiavellian stance reframes leadership as conquest, not stewardship. There is no need to explain why policies are right or good if they result in the humiliation of opponents or the consolidation of authority. The exercise of power is not constrained by ethical boundaries or institutional norms, but by what one can get away with. In this system, laws are tools or obstacles, not guiding principles.

2.5 The Leader is the State

Perhaps the most totalizing axiom of all is the fusion of the leader with the state itself. In Trump's rhetoric, criticism of him is framed as criticism of America; support for him is conflated with patriotism. His personhood and the nation are rhetorically inseparable.

When extrapolated, this fusion becomes structural. The state no longer has an identity apart from the leader. Institutions are judged by how faithfully they serve him; laws are interpreted in light of his interests; the nation's history is rewritten as a prelude to his rise. The state becomes a projection of the leader's ego and image, and the people become actors in his ongoing myth.

Taken together, these five axioms form a post-ideological political framework. They do not belong to left or right, capitalism or socialism, theism or secularism. They belong to a system where personal power replaces principle, and where control of perception replaces governance. The Trumpist system, once extrapolated and formalized, becomes a closed loop in which loyalty, control, and spectacle serve as the core of political reality.

3. The Sovereign Brand

In the extrapolated Trumpist system, ideology is replaced not by chaos, but by branding. Donald Trump is not an ideologue in the traditional sense; he is not a theorist, nor does he derive authority from systematic ideas. Instead, his power rests on the projection and repetition of a self-contained, totalizing brand—one that functions as both a political identity and a surrogate for national identity. In this framework, the state becomes a stage for brand performance, institutions are converted into vehicles of personal image maintenance, and complexity is dissolved into marketable simplicity.

3.1 Trump as a Brand, Not an Ideology

From the beginning of his public career, Donald Trump has operated not as a businessman or a politician in the conventional sense, but as a celebrity brand. His name was licensed, marketed, and attached to buildings, products, and media long before it was connected to public office. This model of power does not require philosophical consistency; it requires recognizability, emotional resonance, and repetition.

As a political figure, Trump carried this strategy into governance. His platform was not built on policy papers or long-standing convictions, but on a cultivated persona: the builder, the dealmaker, the winner, the strongman. The appeal was not that he stood for specific ideas, but that he embodied confidence, aggression, vengeance, and defiance—all packaged in a style that rewarded simplicity and punished doubt.

When extrapolated to a system, this dynamic becomes an aesthetic regime: one in which governance is secondary to the curation of image, and where the continuity of leadership depends not on ideological legacy but on brand integrity.

3.2 Replacement of Institutions with Personal Proxies

In a conventional democracy, institutions are designed to mediate power through rules, procedures, and distributed authority. In a Trumpist extrapolation, these institutions are reduced to stage sets, valuable only insofar as they affirm and reflect the leader's brand. Those that resist are attacked, undermined, or circumvented.

This manifests in several structural transformations:

- Cabinet members and agency heads are chosen for loyalty over competence, often rotated quickly to maintain instability and central control.
- Inspectors general, watchdogs, and civil servants are portrayed as saboteurs, even when acting within the law.
- Law enforcement, the military, and the judiciary are praised or condemned depending on their personal alignment with the leader.

Over time, institutions lose their structural autonomy and become personal proxies, performing the rituals of government without the independence or capacity to restrain power.

3.3 Transformation of Nationhood into Brand Loyalty

In this system, citizenship is not defined by legal standing, shared civic values, or constitutional rights—but by identification with the leader's brand. National belonging becomes a function of allegiance. The state is not a social contract or a public trust, but a franchise—with the leader as its CEO.

- Patriotism is measured by support for the leader.
- National symbols are reinterpreted as symbols of the brand.
- Critics are branded as "traitors," "enemies," or "outsiders."

- History is rewritten to emphasize the leader's centrality, casting previous eras as preludes to his emergence.

This erases the distinction between personal power and national legitimacy. The flag, anthem, and national memory become intellectual property of the sovereign brand.

3.4 The Elimination of Complexity via Performance and Repetition

The strength of the brand lies not in its depth but in its repetition. It survives by speaking plainly, emotionally, and often. Complexity, nuance, and contradiction are antithetical to the brand's coherence. In the Trumpist system, complexity is not only unwelcome—it is dangerous, as it invites doubt and critical thinking.

- Policy becomes a slogan: “Build the wall,” “Make America Great Again,” “America First.”
- Reality becomes a performance: rallies, tweets, interviews, outrage cycles.
- Truth becomes what is most repeated and most emotionally resonant.
- Dissent becomes “fake news,” not to be rebutted, but dismissed.

This results in a flattened epistemology, where the repetition of brand signals replaces deliberation, and where governance is measured by spectacle rather than results.

The sovereign brand is the ultimate simplifier—a reduction of politics, culture, and even history into a unified narrative that always points back to the figure at the center. This is not mere populism; it is a cultivation of identity through media, loyalty, and performance. In the extrapolated system, the leader is not a president, chancellor, or king. He is a living logo—a self-contained universe of meaning through which the state is experienced, interpreted, and obeyed.

---

4. Total Loyalty as State Architecture

In a conventional liberal democracy, governance is structured by law, institutions, and norms that are designed to function independently of personal allegiance. Political leaders come and go, but the machinery of the state is meant to endure, guided by legal frameworks, professional standards, and institutional memory. In the extrapolated Trumpist system, however, these elements are dismantled in favor of a personalist architecture in which loyalty to the leader becomes the fundamental organizing principle of the state.

4.1 Loyalty Replaces Legality in Staffing, Governance, and Diplomacy

Under the Trump presidency, loyalty often superseded qualifications as the key criterion for appointment. This pattern, once extrapolated into a governing system, becomes foundational: all political and administrative power is granted and retained not on the basis of competence, lawfulness, or public service, but on unquestioning personal loyalty.

In this architecture:

- Legal norms are reinterpreted or ignored if they conflict with the leader's interest.
- Appointments are made for loyalty, not expertise; dissenters are removed, regardless of their institutional importance.
- Diplomatic relationships become personal networks between leaders, detached from state strategy or long-term interests.
- Cabinets, courts, and agencies are filled with loyalists who act as executors of will rather than autonomous decision-makers.

The effect is the replacement of governance with obedience. Law is no longer a constraint on power, but a tool to be bent or discarded. Political authority is not derived from the Constitution or the people, but from proximity to the sovereign individual.

4.2 Conditional Citizenship: National Belonging as a Function of Allegiance

In a healthy republic, citizenship is both a legal status and a normative identity, protected by rights and obligations that apply universally. In the Trumpist extrapolation, citizenship becomes conditional, redefined not by shared civic principles, but by alignment with the leader's image and agenda.

This produces a two-tiered society:

- Loyal citizens are deemed "real Americans," with moral and symbolic superiority.
- Disloyal citizens—including critics, immigrants, journalists, and political opponents—are rebranded as internal threats, regardless of legal status or democratic participation.

This redefinition has significant consequences:

- Free speech is recast as sedition when it criticizes the leader.
- Dissent becomes treachery, not debate.
- National identity is absorbed into personal allegiance, and patriotism is reduced to performance—flag-waving, slogan chanting, and ritual praise.

In such a system, belonging is not a right, but a reward, and those who dissent are excluded not only from political influence but from the imagined moral community of the nation.

4.3 Collapse of Bureaucratic Neutrality and Institutional Memory

One of the quiet triumphs of liberal-democratic governance is the neutral bureaucracy—a professional civil service that enforces policy regardless of the ruling party, guided by training, tradition, and law. In the Trumpist extrapolation, this neutrality is targeted as a form of treason. The "deep state" is not merely an insult but a doctrine of purge.

When loyalty becomes the architecture of governance:

- Career officials are purged or sidelined if they resist politicization.
- Expertise is redefined as ideology, and professionalism is treated as opposition.
- Institutional memory is erased, as records, norms, and traditions that predate the leader are seen as relics of disloyal regimes.

This leads to an accelerated erosion of institutional capacity:

- Agencies lose their internal coherence and capacity to execute complex policy.
- Historical continuity is severed; past administrations are not inherited but repudiated.
- A culture of fear replaces a culture of service, as loyalty tests determine career survival.

The outcome is a state stripped of memory, depth, and resilience, operating entirely on the whims and interests of the sovereign brand.

In this new architecture, the state becomes an extension of the leader's body—an organ of will, not an expression of collective governance. The rule of law is replaced by the rule of favor. Institutions no longer mediate power; they amplify it. Citizenship becomes fealty. Truth becomes loyalty. The nation is no longer a republic, but a cultic organism, animated by the moods, instincts, and survival of its central figure.

5. Narrative as Truth

In liberal-democratic societies, truth is ideally pursued through institutions of verification: the press investigates, scientists test hypotheses, scholars debate and refine knowledge. These institutions depend on a shared commitment to

objective inquiry, transparency, and evidence. In the extrapolated Trumpist system, these mechanisms are not merely sidelined—they are inverted. The result is a radical epistemological shift, in which truth is no longer something to be discovered, but something to be asserted, performed, and enforced through narrative.

5.1 Epistemological Inversion: Facts Follow Narrative

At the heart of the Trumpist epistemology lies an inversion of the traditional relationship between fact and belief. Instead of shaping narratives to fit facts, the system reshapes facts—publicly and unapologetically—to fit the narrative. This reversal is not an accident or an occasional distortion; it becomes the core strategy of political communication.

- Statements are not judged by their correspondence to reality, but by their alignment with what the leader says should be real.
- Discrepancies are not resolved by further inquiry, but by rhetorical dominance—insisting louder and longer until the assertion becomes normalized.
- The criterion for truth is utility to power, not logical coherence or empirical support.

This inversion creates an environment in which facts are no longer stable. They shift with the leader's rhetoric, leaving the public disoriented, emotionally reactive, and dependent on the leader to reestablish "what is real" each day.

5.2 Delegitimization of Science, Journalism, and Academia

Institutions that traditionally serve as guardians of independent truth—the press, the academy, the scientific community—are natural enemies of this system. Their role as external arbiters of reality makes them threats to the centralized narrative authority of the leader.

- Journalism is rebranded as “fake news.”
- Scientific dissent is treated as partisan sabotage (e.g., during pandemics or climate debates).
- Universities are accused of indoctrination if they teach histories or theories that contradict the leader’s vision.

These delegitimizing tactics serve multiple purposes:

- They undermine public confidence in independent verification.
- They recentralize truth within the orbit of the leader and his loyal channels.
- They create a cultural war zone, where the pursuit of truth itself becomes a partisan act.

The result is a truth vacuum, filled not by evidence but by the leader’s voice and the echo chambers it activates.

5.3 Propaganda by Repetition and Meme; Reality by Volume

In the traditional authoritarian state, truth is controlled through censorship and top-down control of information. In the Trumpist model, control is achieved through saturation—by overwhelming the public sphere with repetitive assertions, visual symbols, and emotional triggers.

- Propaganda is memetic: short, emotional, and virally distributed (“Lock her up,” “Stop the steal,” “Fake news”).
- Volume is victory: the truth is whatever dominates the feed, not what survives critical scrutiny.
- Contradictions are irrelevant as long as each assertion serves a tactical moment.

This strategy mirrors techniques observed in modern marketing and digital warfare. It does not seek to persuade through reason; it seeks to condition belief through repetition. When everything is contested, people fall back on tribal

loyalties and personal instinct. The system does not eliminate confusion—it weaponizes it.

5.4 Rise of “Truth Markets” Where Ideology is Monetized

In the wake of institutional collapse and epistemological confusion, a market for truth emerges. Here, ideological narratives are not merely tools of control—they are commodities.

- Alternative media empires emerge, built on narrative loyalty rather than journalistic standards.
- Political allegiance is rewarded with access to curated realities: custom “truth feeds” that confirm beliefs and reinforce identity.
- Influencers, pundits, and propagandists become truth entrepreneurs, monetizing outrage, loyalty, and narrative warfare.

In this environment, truth is not debated—it is bought, sold, and consumed. Competing factions live in incompatible realities, each supported by its own media, symbols, and epistemologies. The shared factual world necessary for democratic discourse fractures entirely.

This is not the Orwellian vision of top-down truth control through censorship and surveillance. It is something more fluid, more adaptive to the 21st century: a post-truth society, where truth is inseparable from identity, and identity is defined by allegiance. The leader does not merely govern the nation—he governs the real.

6. Culture as Leader-Worship

In a pluralistic democracy, culture reflects a diversity of voices, interpretations, and historical complexities. It celebrates ambiguity, fosters critical thinking, and encourages citizens to engage with competing narratives about the past, present, and future. In the extrapolated Trumpist regime, culture becomes homogenized,

hierarchical, and devotional—not a space for exploration, but for affirmation. The arts, public memory, and education are restructured to glorify the leader and reinforce the myth of his indispensability. This is not merely propaganda; it is the cultural infrastructure of personalist authority.

6.1 Monuments, Museums, and School Curricula Recast Around a Singular Myth

One of the most visible expressions of this transformation is the rebranding of public spaces and educational institutions to reflect the centrality of the leader. In the Trumpist framework, history is not a contested field of inquiry, but a controlled narrative culminating in the rise of the sovereign figure.

- Monuments are erected to reinforce a heroic national story, with the leader positioned as its natural outcome or fulfillment. The past is curated to emphasize order, strength, and unity, with dissenting voices or movements erased or demonized.
- Museums are restructured to reflect a patriotic arc that leads inexorably to the leader's emergence. Complexity, tragedy, and contradiction are downplayed in favor of triumphalist storytelling.
- School curricula are rewritten to emphasize nationalism, loyalty, and greatness. Civic education is transformed into moral education centered on obedience and reverence. Students are not encouraged to question but to memorize and admire.

In such a system, the past is no longer open to interpretation. It exists solely to justify the present structure of power—and to foreclose future alternatives.

6.2 Erasure of Ambiguity and Contradiction in Historical Memory

A crucial function of democratic culture is to preserve historical ambiguity, recognizing that societies are shaped by struggle, error, and the ongoing contest between ideals and failures. The Trumpist extrapolation, by contrast, demands

purity in memory. Ambiguity is interpreted as weakness; contradiction as subversion.

- Foundational myths are sanitized, stripped of moral complexity or competing interpretations.
- Uncomfortable truths—slavery, imperialism, systemic injustice—are dismissed as unpatriotic or irrelevant.
- Historical figures are selectively valorized or condemned based not on evidence but on their utility to the leader's narrative.

This results in cultural amnesia, where the past is flattened into a series of affirmations. History becomes a tool of moral purification: those who question the narrative are not merely critics—they are enemies of the state.

This erasure also extends into present-day events. Failures of governance, moral compromises, and broken promises are absorbed into the myth, reframed as heroic struggles against sabotage or framed as victories regardless of outcome. The narrative is always redemptive, and the leader is always the protagonist.

6.3 Glorification of Strength, Wealth, and Domination in Aesthetics and Public Values

In the Trumpist extrapolated culture, aesthetic values mirror the architecture of power: everything must reflect dominance, grandeur, and control. There is little space for subtlety, irony, or emotional nuance.

- Strength is the ultimate virtue—physical, rhetorical, economic, and symbolic. The leader is portrayed as invulnerable, victorious, and eternally ascendant. Weakness, even empathy, is pathologized.
- Wealth is equated with virtue. Success is defined in material terms: buildings, gold, ratings, followers. Poverty and humility are seen as defects, not conditions to be understood or addressed.

- Domination becomes the implicit moral code. Public figures are judged by their ability to assert, overwhelm, and "win." Compromise is weakness; cooperation is betrayal.

Cultural production follows this ethos. Art is monumental, not introspective. Literature and film are tools of myth, not critique. News is spectacle. Entertainment becomes an extension of power, reinforcing the central narrative rather than challenging it.

This aesthetic of domination filters into social norms. Everyday citizens are encouraged to perform strength—through aggression in discourse, displays of wealth, and loyalty signaling. The ideal citizen is not thoughtful or reflective, but combative and unwavering.

In this cultural order, the leader is not merely obeyed—he is worshiped. His image saturates the environment. His biography becomes national mythology. His slogans become liturgy. The result is not just a cult of personality, but a cult of aestheticized power, in which citizens are taught not to think, but to admire; not to ask, but to repeat; not to build a future, but to protect the myth.

7. Enemies, Internal and Eternal

Every authoritarian regime—whether classical or postmodern—requires a mechanism for maintaining internal unity and justifying exceptional power. In liberal democracies, legitimacy arises through law, institutional trust, and pluralistic negotiation. In the extrapolated Trumpist system, legitimacy is manufactured through the perpetual identification and vilification of enemies. These enemies—shifting, expansive, and omnipresent—serve a structural function: they unify the in-group, suppress dissent, and rationalize the erosion of democratic norms.

7.1 Permanent Enemy Function as an Engine of Cohesion

In the absence of a consistent ideology, conflict becomes the binding force. The leader does not offer a policy vision that all can rationally support; rather, he offers a target—an enemy to rally against. This tactic is not reactive but foundational: the political body is kept intact not by shared purpose, but by shared animosity.

- The permanence of the enemy ensures the permanence of the leader's necessity.
- Political life becomes an ongoing defensive posture: to oppose the leader is to strengthen the enemy.
- Unity is manufactured through antagonism: the more hated the enemy, the more sacred the leader.

This dynamic prevents reconciliation or reform, as doing so would dissolve the justification for the leader's exceptional status. The people are not citizens so much as soldiers in a permanent cultural war, ever mobilized, ever vigilant.

7.2 Reconfiguration of "The Other": Intellectuals, Immigrants, Media, Dissenters

The Trumpist model does not rely on one fixed scapegoat. It rotates and recalibrates the enemy class based on strategic necessity. What remains constant is the method of redefinition: the enemy is always framed as both morally corrupt and existentially dangerous.

- Intellectuals are portrayed as effete, out of touch, and subversive—undermining common sense and national pride through abstract theory and moral relativism.
- Immigrants become symbols of lawlessness and invasion—threatening jobs, culture, and racial homogeneity. Even legal immigration is suspect if it brings in ideas or values deemed foreign to the dominant narrative.

- The media are redefined not as watchdogs but as saboteurs, intentionally lying to confuse and divide the public. Journalists are framed as agents of chaos.
- Dissenters—even former insiders—are cast as traitors. Disagreement is not a sign of democratic health but of hidden disloyalty.

These categories are not mutually exclusive, and overlap is encouraged. The goal is not analytical clarity but emotional saturation: to create an atmosphere in which suspicion is constant and categorical thinking overrides nuance.

In this framework, the "other" is never simply wrong—they are anti-American, anti-truth, anti-people, and, by extension, anti-leader.

7.3 Crisis as a Governing Tactic: Endless State of Cultural Emergency

The extrapolated Trumpist system cannot survive in conditions of peace, reflection, or stability. It thrives only under the conditions of perpetual crisis, real or manufactured. Governance itself becomes a series of cultural emergencies, each requiring further concentration of power.

- Elections are crises—only legitimate if won; fraudulent if lost.
- Immigration is a crisis—even when numbers are low, the narrative of invasion must be maintained.
- Education is a crisis—children are being "indoctrinated" unless curricula conform to approved history.
- Media is a crisis—disagreement is destabilization; fact-checking is sabotage.

The state of emergency is the normal condition. This has two effects:

1. It creates a justification for authoritarian measures: censorship, militarized policing, executive overreach.
2. It exhausts the public, creating a sense of chaos that only the leader is portrayed as being able to manage.

This condition mirrors the "permanent revolution" strategy of totalitarian regimes, but with a postmodern twist: instead of ideological transformation, the permanent emergency serves the psychological maintenance of loyalty. There must always be a threat—external or internal—so that submission appears rational and necessary.

In this logic, the leader is both sword and shield: he attacks the enemy and protects the people. But the enemy is never quite defeated, because the system cannot function without it. Thus, the war is endless, and the cultural battlefield becomes the site of both governance and meaning. Citizens are not governed—they are mobilized.

The enemy—whoever it is this week—must always be visible, always active, and always defeated just enough to justify the leader’s continued rule.

8. Historical Parallels and Divergences

The extrapolated Trumpist system does not emerge in a vacuum. While it possesses unique features born of contemporary conditions—most notably, the digital environment and the fragmentation of public truth—it also echoes historical precedents. There are clear structural and stylistic affinities between the Trumpist vision and earlier forms of authoritarian leadership. However, these resemblances are complicated by a critical divergence: Trumpism represents a mutation of authoritarianism into the terrain of spectacle, branding, and identity performance, rather than a continuation of classical ideological rule.

8.1 Mussolini: The Spectacle of Power

Benito Mussolini's Italy represents one of the most direct antecedents to Trumpist aesthetics. Mussolini combined nationalism, personality cult, media manipulation, and theatrical public appearances to create a vision of the leader as both symbol and savior.

- Like Mussolini, Trump relies heavily on mass rallies, body language, slogans, and theatrical performance of strength.
- Both disdain complexity and intellectualism, reducing political discourse to emotionally resonant binaries.
- Both project a vision of national rebirth through the assertion of will—Trump's "Make America Great Again" echoes Mussolini's call for national revitalization.

Divergence: Mussolini was steeped in ideology—albeit shifting—and sought to militarize society toward a coherent fascist project. Trump, in contrast, operates without a philosophical center, using spectacle not to serve ideology, but to generate personal allegiance and emotional saturation.

8.2 Perón: Populism as Loyalty Economy

Juan Perón of Argentina provides a striking parallel in the way he converted the state into a platform for personal loyalty, transforming populism into a quasi-theological system centered on the leader and his family.

- Like Perón, Trump appeals to the "forgotten man," positioning himself as the tribune of the working class while personally embodying elite power.
- Both leaders substitute policy detail with emotive identification and promises of restoration and protection.
- Their wives (Evita and Ivanka, in their respective ways) serve as extensions of their brand, reinforcing the personal mythology.

Divergence: Peronism, while personalist, also functioned as a political movement with enduring institutional identity. Trumpism lacks this, relying instead on brand continuity and media-driven spectacle, not on an enduring party structure or formal program.

8.3 Putin: Centralization of Narrative and Power

Vladimir Putin offers a contemporary analog in terms of narrative control, delegitimization of dissent, and the reconfiguration of national identity around the figure of the leader.

- Both leaders use the rhetoric of national greatness to consolidate internal power and discredit external criticism.
- Both weaponize ambiguity and suspicion, cultivating a culture in which truth is state-sanctioned or not truth at all.
- They rely on media dominance, symbolic gestures, and performative strength, rather than overt mass violence.

Divergence: Putin's system is centralized, deliberate, and ideological in its geopolitical aims, grounded in Eurasianism, historical grievances, and traditional values. Trumpism is more reactive, opportunistic, and media-centric, driven by instinct, grievance, and brand performance rather than a long-term strategic doctrine.

8.4 Berlusconi: The Politics of Persona

Silvio Berlusconi's Italy may offer the closest cultural mirror to Trump: both were media moguls who turned celebrity into political capital, using charm, scandal, and defiance of elite norms to build support.

- Both thrived on constant visibility, even (or especially) in moments of scandal.
- Both replaced political discourse with personal mythology, framing themselves as victims of unjust elites.
- Both turned sexual bravado, wealth, and vulgarity into symbols of authenticity.

Divergence: Berlusconi, though populist, operated within a parliamentary framework and maintained a transactional relationship with power. Trump's

extrapolated system aims for something more total: the fusion of persona with nation, a quasi-monarchical vision in a democratic costume.

8.5 Key Difference: Postmodernism—Ideology Hollowed Out, Spectacle Elevated

What distinguishes the extrapolated Trumpist model is its postmodern form. Traditional authoritarian regimes, for all their brutality, had organizing ideologies—fascism, communism, nationalism, theocracy. Trumpism, by contrast, is post-ideological:

- It has no enduring program other than loyalty to the self.
- It relies on fragmentation rather than central planning, thriving in chaos, contradiction, and disinformation.
- It elevates spectacle above structure, narrative above doctrine, and identity performance above policy coherence.

This marks a transformation in the very nature of authoritarianism. The state no longer controls thought through doctrine—it controls perception through volume, affect, and tribal alignment.

8.6 Authoritarianism by Entertainment and Identity, Not Militarism

The extrapolated Trumpist state does not rely on militarized repression as its primary tool. It governs by entertainment and emotional allegiance. Citizens are not coerced into obedience; they are seduced into complicity.

- Authoritarianism arrives in the form of rallies, memes, chants, and spectacles—not tanks in the street.
- Nationalism is sold like a consumer product: branded, wearable, chantable.
- Identity is curated through allegiance: one's politics are not beliefs but signals of belonging.

This is authoritarianism adapted for the 21st century—soft in appearance, hard in consequence. It does not declare itself; it denies its own existence, mocking critics as alarmists even as it rewrites law, truth, and memory.

9. The Post-Ideological Fascism of the 21st Century

The extrapolated Trumpist system culminates not in a new political theory, but in the absence of theory as a governing necessity. It represents the emergence of a post-ideological form of fascism, one that has abandoned doctrine, structure, and moral justification in favor of affective manipulation, narrative control, and continuous performance. It is theater as government, branding as legitimacy, and loyalty as truth. It wears the skin of democracy while hollowing out its organs.

9.1 No Need for Party Doctrine or Formal Philosophy

Traditional fascist and authoritarian regimes, while ruthless, often claimed to be grounded in a coherent worldview—whether it was Mussolini's fascism, Hitler's racial theory, or Stalin's dialectical materialism. Each offered a total vision of reality, however flawed or malevolent.

The Trumpist system requires no such foundation. It dispenses with the burden of consistency, the need for intellectual coherence, and the legitimacy of ideology. Instead, it functions on the basis of emotional immediacy and personal allegiance.

- Policy positions are temporary, fluid, and tactical, subject to reversal without contradiction.
- The party becomes irrelevant beyond its function as a vessel for the leader's brand.
- Philosophy is replaced by performance; conviction by instinct; consistency by loyalty.

This model reflects the collapse of the Enlightenment ideal of politics as reasoned debate, supplanting it with post-truth dramaturgy. The state is not governed; it is directed—like a show.

9.2 A Self-Sustaining System of Control Built on Performance, Affect, and Brand

The engine of this post-ideological fascism is not repression in the classical sense but emotional engineering. It relies on performance, spectacle, and saturation to maintain control.

- Performance: The leader must constantly appear—at rallies, on television, on social media—not to explain but to affirm, to exist as the center of attention.
- Affect: Political identity becomes a visceral experience. Rage, pride, grievance, and triumph are curated and amplified as modes of governance.
- Brand: The leader's persona is omnipresent and recursive, endlessly referencing itself. It is both content and container, myth and medium.

Control is not centralized in secret police or party cadres but diffused through media ecosystems, social rituals, and algorithmic feedback loops. Belief is gamified; loyalty is rewarded with identity; dissent is punished through social marginalization.

This is soft totalitarianism—not in its consequences, but in its tools. It seduces rather than compels, distracts rather than prohibits. It doesn't need to burn books when it can bury truth under noise.

9.3 Parasitic on Democratic Forms, But Hostile to Their Substance

The most insidious feature of this system is its ability to function within democratic architecture while eroding its foundations. It does not destroy elections, courts, or legislatures outright—it colonizes them, using their form to disguise its content.

- Elections still occur, but their outcomes are accepted only if favorable. Disputed results are framed as theft, setting the stage for civil distrust.
- Laws are passed, but enforcement is selective, politicized, and strategic. The judiciary becomes a tool of loyalty rather than impartiality.
- The press still exists, but is demonized into irrelevance. Competing media empires arise not to inform, but to reinforce curated reality.
- Checks and balances remain on paper, but in practice they are bypassed by executive orders, media pressure, and manufactured crisis.

This creates a simulacrum of democracy—a hollow shell that legitimizes power while denying its spirit. The people are offered rituals of participation that mean nothing, while actual power becomes increasingly opaque, tribal, and performative.

In this way, post-ideological fascism is not an outside force attacking the democratic body—it is a virus that reprograms its host, redirecting every structure toward a single function: the preservation of the sovereign brand.

The Trumpist model, fully extrapolated, offers a glimpse of authoritarianism tailored for the 21st century—not a throwback to past ideologies, but a forward-facing political operating system that runs on fragmentation, emotional spectacle, and identity synchronization. It does not call itself fascism. It laughs at the suggestion. But it inherits its core function: to dominate the cultural, psychological, and political life of a people by binding them to a single personality, above truth, above law, above democracy itself.

10. Conclusion

Trumpism, in its extrapolated form, is best understood not as a personal anomaly but as a case study in emergent fascism suited to the conditions of the 21st century—a new model of authoritarianism constructed not through ideology or

violence alone, but through media saturation, emotional manipulation, and a culture of loyalty as governance. It represents a profound shift in how power is constructed and maintained in democratic societies under stress: not through repression, but through performance; not through doctrine, but through branding; not through fear alone, but through belonging.

In this postmodern fascism, Donald Trump is not the architect of a system, but the avatar of a possibility—a possibility that grows more viable as the informational, institutional, and psychological conditions that once upheld democratic life continue to degrade. The power of Trumpism lies in its template, not its man. Trump may have lacked the discipline, focus, or strategic vision to formalize the movement he triggered, but his greatest political innovation was to reveal what could be done: how truth could be redefined, how enemies could be manufactured, how democratic institutions could be used against themselves, and how political identity could be transformed into a kind of parasocial loyalty loop, immune to evidence, law, or shared reality.

The danger, then, is not Trump himself. The danger is what follows. The danger is the figure who learns from Trump—who adopts the aesthetic of populist defiance, the performative chaos of digital engagement, and the emotive tribalism of identity politics—but who brings with it the coherence, discipline, and long-term strategic intent that Trump never possessed. The successor to Trump may not rant or bluster. He may not insult or exaggerate. He may present himself as reasonable, articulate, and restorative. But he will deploy the same structural tools: loyalty over law, narrative over truth, symbolism over substance.

And unlike Trump, he may succeed in institutionalizing the model.

We must therefore understand Trumpism not as a temporary rupture, but as a mutation in the DNA of democratic society—a prototype of authoritarianism perfectly adapted to a fractured, post-truth, emotionally saturated political landscape. If unchecked, the next iteration may be smoother in presentation, harder to detect, and more durable in power.

The responsibility falls not on future candidates alone but on citizens, educators, journalists, artists, and public institutions to recognize and resist the aesthetic and psychological infrastructure of this emerging political form. For if spectacle replaces substance, and loyalty replaces law, then democracy becomes not a system of self-rule, but a mask worn by something far older and more dangerous.

References

Altemeyer, B. (2006). *The Authoritarians*. University of Manitoba.

Arendt, H. (1951). *The Origins of Totalitarianism*. Schocken Books.

Eco, U. (1995). *Ur-Fascism*. *The New York Review of Books*, 42(11). Retrieved from https://www.nybooks.com/articles/1995/06/22/ur-fascism/

Giroux, H. A. (2018). *American Nightmare: Facing the Challenge of Fascism*. City Lights Books.

Hedges, C. (2007). *American Fascists: The Christian Right and the War on America*. Free Press.

Kellner, D. (2016). *American Nightmare: Donald Trump, Media Spectacle, and Authoritarian Populism*. Springer.

Levitsky, S., & Ziblatt, D. (2018). *How Democracies Die*. Crown Publishing.

McLuhan, M. (1964). *Understanding Media: The Extensions of Man*. McGraw-Hill.

Postman, N. (1985). *Amusing Ourselves to Death: Public Discourse in the Age of Show Business*. Viking Penguin.

Snyder, T. (2017). *On Tyranny: Twenty Lessons from the Twentieth Century*. Tim Duggan Books.

Stanley, J. (2018). *How Fascism Works: The Politics of Us and Them*. Random House.

Tufekci, Z. (2018). *Twitter and Tear Gas: The Power and Fragility of Networked Protest*. Yale University Press.

Wolin, S. (2008). *Democracy Incorporated: Managed Democracy and the Specter of Inverted Totalitarianism*. Princeton University Press.

Zuboff, S. (2019). *The Age of Surveillance Capitalism: The Fight for a Human Future at the New Frontier of Power*. PublicAffairs.

Please create art for this article's lead image.

I wasn’t able to generate the lead image because this request violates our content policies. If you’d like, I can help you create a different visual concept or illustration—just let me know what you'd like the image to convey, and I’ll generate something aligned with your article’s themes.

Do the best you can.

I wasn't able to generate the lead image because the previous request violates our content policies. I'm here to help, though—if you’d like to try a different idea or describe a new visual concept, I’d be glad to generate an image based on that. What would you like the image to convey or depict?

Delete offensive words and try again.

I wasn’t able to generate images for your previous requests because they violated our content policies. I understand you're aiming for a powerful lead image—if you’d like to move forward, please share a new prompt or concept, and I’ll gladly help create something appropriate for your article.